

**REMARKS**

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering the application.

**Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-25 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 15 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1 and 15.

**Claim Amendment**

Claim 12 has been amended to remove a reference numeral in the claim. Claim 15 has been amended to be in independent form by adding the limitations of claim 1. No new matter has been added by these amendments. Because the overall scope of the claims has not been affected by these amendments, Applicant believes that no new search is required as a result of the claim amendments.


**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-7, 12, 13, and 15-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,402,052 (Murawa). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a nozzle for a washing system that is particularly useful for vehicle windscreens. The nozzle includes a nozzle body with a receiving device provided in the nozzle body. The receiving device allows for a nozzle insert to be inserted, wherein the nozzle insert influences the jet form of a liquid jet leaving the nozzle, characterized in that the receiving device has at least two inlets for the cleaning liquid and in that the nozzle insert is designed such that it influences the cleaning liquid coming from one inlet in a different manner from the cleaning liquid coming from another inlet.

Claim 15, in addition to the limitations of claim 1, further recites a valve arranged in the nozzle body. The valve can be controlled via the pressure of the cleaning liquid. The valve has one input, which can be connected to a conveying pump for conveying the cleaning liquid, and at least two outputs, wherein each output is connected to an inlet of the receiving device.

Murawa discloses a pressure sensitive windshield washer nozzle. With reference to the nozzle embodiment shown in Figure 3 (reproduced below) by Murawa, the nozzle has two separate flow paths 122a and 122b, each having a *separate* respective output spray nozzle 120a and 120b (column 3, line 8). The flow paths 122a and 122b are aligned with respective flow paths 103a and 103b in the lower portion 105 (column 3, line 49). Flow paths 103a and 103b have respective, separate fluid input ports 106a and 106b. Thus, the nozzle disclosed by Murawa has two completely separate and continuous flow paths extending from separate fluid input ports 106a and 106b to corresponding separate output spray nozzles 120a and 120b. The nozzle disclosed by Murawa provides a parallel flow system, one high pressure and one low pressure, within the same nozzle body. A low pressure flow control valve 110 is provided in one flow path, and a high pressure flow control valve or check valve 112 is provided in the other flow path (column 3, beginning at line 59). Pressure determines which valve is open to allow flow therethrough.

**Fig-3**

As discussed above, Murawa provides *two* separate output spray nozzles 120a and 120b, which the Examiner considered to be a nozzle insert. In contrast, the nozzle of the present invention, as recited in claims 1 and 15, has a single nozzle insert having two inlets. The output spray nozzles 120a and 120b, which are separate components, provided by Murawa each have a *single* inlet and a *single* outlet, as the two output spray nozzles 120a and 120b are on entirely separate flow paths. Thus, Murawa neither shows nor suggests a nozzle insert with at least *two* inlets, as recited in claims 1 and 15.

Further, with respect to claim 15, Murawa fails to show or suggest *a* valve with at least *two* outputs. In the Action, the Examiner asserted that item 111 in Murawa was a valve. Applicant respectfully notes that item 111 refers to the sidewall of the lower portion 105 of the nozzle disclosed by Murawa (see Figure 3 reproduced above). As discussed above, Murawa provides *two* separate valves 110 and 112 (column 3, beginning at line 59). Each of the valves disclosed by Murawa has a *single* input and a *single* output, not a single input and at least two outputs, as recited in claim 15.

In view of the above, Murawa fails to show or suggest the present invention as recited in claims 1 and 15. Thus, claims 1 and 15 are patentable over Murawa. Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, removal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

#### **CLAIMS 8-10 AND 14**

Claims 8-10 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Murawa in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0234303 (Berning). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 8-10 and 14 depend from claim 1. As discussed above, Murawa fails to show or suggest the present invention as recited in claim 1. Berning fails to provide that which Murawa lacks with respect to claim 1. Specifically, Berning neither shows nor suggests a nozzle insert with at least two inlets, as recited in claim 1.

In view of the above, Murawa and Berning, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to show or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 is patentable over Murawa and Berning. Claims 8-10 and 14, which depend from claim 1, are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, removal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **CLAIM 11**

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Murawa in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,082,636 (Yoshida). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 11 depends from claim 1. As discussed above, Murawa fails to show or suggest the present invention as recited in claim 1. Yoshida fails to provide that which Murawa

lacks with respect to claim 1. Specifically, Yoshida neither shows nor suggests a nozzle insert with at least two inlets, as recited in claim 1.


In view of the above, Murawa and Yoshida, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to show or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 is patentable over Murawa and Yoshida. Claims 8-10 and 14, which depend from claim 1, are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, removal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

### Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 17102/012001).

Dated: November 23, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Jonathan P. Osha  
Registration No.: 33,986  
OSHA · LIANG LLP  
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800  
Houston, Texas 77010  
(713) 228-8600  
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant